

**AGENDA REVIEW Questions**  
**June 6, 2013**

**FINANCE**

**Int. 189 (33) – Amending the Municipal Code, Traffic Ordinance**

*Q: How will the City be publicizing these changes? Are they going to be on the web, official notification in the paper, etc.? (Conklin)*

A: No changes are being made to substantive parking provisions. We're simply placing existing parking rules in the City Code. Enforcement will be unaffected and the public will not notice a change in the rules.

*Q: Will there be signage for the changes? (Scott)*

A: No change to current signage is required. The applicable rules on individual City streets marked by signage overcome any general rules and will still be in full force and effect.

**Int. 223 (39) – Inter-Municipal Agreement – Rochester City School District, Summer Literacy**

*Q: How specifically does this support 3<sup>d</sup> grade reading levels; is there an expected outcome? (Spaul)*

A: The Literacy Aides will work with children in all grades who register for the library's summer reading program and will vigorously promote ROC Reads. Primary activities performed by Literacy Aides include reading to children, listening to children read aloud, and assisting with vocabulary and comprehension. Literacy Aides also use worksheets provided through the NYSED Summer Reading Program manuals and local teachers, and assist children with Accelerated Reader progress. At this time, the library has no quantitative or qualitative measure to connect summer reading participation to school performance. However, the library is now working with RCSD IT to find a way to include student participation in library and DRYS programs in RCSD record-keeping to link improved student performance with City program participation. We have a call June 14 with RCSD, City, and Library IT staff members to start the serious work on this. It is critical to find a way to measure the effectiveness of the many, many community programs being funded to help improve student performance. NYSED is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on summer reading in NYS libraries every year, but there is currently no way for us to determine if the programs have an effect on summer slide. However, there is research showing participation in library summer reading programs helps reduce or eliminate the summer slide. Additional information can be found at:

[http://gslis.dom.edu/sites/default/files/documents/IMLS\\_executiveSummary.pdf](http://gslis.dom.edu/sites/default/files/documents/IMLS_executiveSummary.pdf)

*Q: How will the high school students that are working be recruited? (Warren)*

A: Students have been recruited through high school principals and through the Summer of Opportunity program. We have 11 students ready to go July 1 with a full day of training with the library's Children's Services Consultant, and then will report to their assigned branches on July 2. The Literacy Aides will work under the supervision of Children's Librarians who have produced summer reading programs for many years.

*Q: How much are we paying the students that are teaching? (Spaul)*

A: \$9.42 an hour for 20 hours a week.

**Int. 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241 (41) – 2013-14 Budget**

*Q: Provide a report on the balance of all funds not shown in the budget; ex. perpetual care fund. (Warren)*

A: Forthcoming.

## NEIGHBORHOOD & BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

### Int. 191 (20) – Acquisition – 298-304 Selye Terrace

*Q: Are the taxes current, and if not, what is owed? Are there code violations added to the taxes? (Conklin)*

A: The City taxes are current and no code violations were added to taxes. County taxes are also paid in full.

*Q: What is the purpose to acquire other than in FIS? Provide more of an explanation? (Warren)*

A: This property has been a blight since before the inception of FIS. Through FIS, the City has provided exterior rehab grants to 60% of properties on this block of Selye Terrace. Acquisition will allow the City to work with neighbors to ensure that it does not continue to detract from the quality of life and, property values on this street, and to protect the public and private investments already in place.

The location in an FIS area, and the resulting availability of funding, is the predominant reason for this acquisition; however, other factors involved that influenced the City's decision to pursue this structure include:

- Maplewood Neighborhood Association's contention that it is a significant and important property within the neighborhood and their desire to see it saved. It is important for the City to retain as much control as possible over an architecturally significant structure.
- Health & Safety – we want to be able to address the property before it presents further health and safety issues. The units were vacated by the NW NSC office in November 2012 for health/safety concerns.
- Crime – vacant properties like this can become locations of undesirable activity including drugs and prostitution which we have battled with in this otherwise stable neighborhood.

*Q: Will there be any rehab plan internally or will this go to RFP? (Warren)*

A: This property will be positioned for an RFP offering. The City may invest some resources to remove personal property left in the house so as to provide safe passage for potential purchasers during the interior showings of the RFP offering and as subsidy for the rehab. In addition, the City will be very involved in the development to ensure high standards of the renovations.

*Q: Is this vacant? And if not, what will happen to the tenants? (Warren/ Conklin)*

A: All units were vacated by the NW NSC office in November 2012 for health/safety concerns.

**Int. 192 (21) – Lease Agreement – Charles Settlement House, Northwest Neighborhood Service Center**

*Q: Why wasn't an RFP done? And why is the form not attached to show the rationale to not conduct one? What is the current cost at the current location? (Conklin)*

A: The City Policy and Procedures for Requests for Proposals relate specifically to procurement of professional services. Leasing of property for municipal purposes is covered under the provisions of Section 21-2 of the City Code. The process includes review and consideration of various sites that meet the criteria for the specific rental space that is needed, followed by negotiation of lease terms, and determination of fair market rent by an independent appraiser. The Real Estate Division serves in the capacity of leasing agent for the City by researching alternatives that are appropriate to each leasing situation.

The current YTD cost (FY 2012-13) to NBD for the existing NW NSC space, located at 1099 Jay Street, is \$10,700. This amount reflects the pro-rata share of the utility expenses only. NBD pays only its pro-rata share of the utility costs as the master lease is under the Rochester Police Department.

*Q: Why lease and not purchase a building? (Ortiz)*

A: In arriving at a lease-or-buy decision, one important consideration for the City is minimizing long-term expense associated with ownership of real estate. As outlined in the annual Priority Building Deficiency Report, the City currently faces substantial expenses for repair and maintenance of existing municipal facilities. A lease situation allows the City to procure space with a smaller initial capital outlay, and to take on responsibility for only those maintenance and repair costs that are associated with the portion of the building that is being leased. The lease is structured so that upon expiration of the first lease term, the City may exercise a renewal option. In this respect, a lease provides greater flexibility than a purchase of real estate, in the event that future programming changes result in relocation of City offices.

*Q: Is there a direct entrance to NSC in this building? (Conklin)*

A: There is a direct entrance. However we will utilize the main entrance in order to accommodate handicap accessibility and to utilize the building reception area.

**Int. 193 (22) – Lease Agreement – Stern Properties, Southeast Neighborhood Service Center**

*Q: Why wasn't an RFP done? And why is the form not attached to show the rationale to not conduct one? What is the current cost at the current location? (Conklin)*

A: Please see response for Int. 192.

*Q: Why lease and not purchase a building? (Ortiz)*

A: Please see response for Int. 192.

*Q: Is there designated parking for this? (Spaul)*

A: Yes, eight spots will be designated for City employees – 5 for RPD cruisers and 3 for personal vehicles.

*Q: Why is the lease time different? (Ortiz)*

A: The lease period is different from the NW NSC lease because there were different property owners involved and each owner had different offering periods.

**Int. 194 (23) – Lease Agreement – Rochester Colonial Manufacturing Corporation, West Side Police Precinct**

*Q: Can this be year-to-year? (McFadden)*

A: Due to the extensive renovations and the associated expense it is cost prohibitive to enter into a 1-year commitment that would obligate the City to re-pay the renovation costs in that same 1-year period. By extending the lease commitment to 5 years, the amount of City resources can be effectively managed and budgeted. In addition, a tenant, generally, can get more favorable terms with a longer-term lease.

*Q: What will the improvements be for the \$250K? (McFadden)*

A: This entails an extensive renovation of the current first floor location. Locker rooms, currently on the second floor, will be relocated to the space to be vacated by the NSC. The Investigation and Platoon areas will be reconfigured to open office work stations with new interior finishes; the main suite entrance, clerical, and waiting areas will also be reconfigured with new finishes. New finishes generally include carpeting, wall and door frame painting, and limited ceiling tile replacement and/or new painted ceiling soffits. New millwork will be installed for the Officer's room, mail slots, and reports areas. Work also includes mechanical and electrical alteration, and HVAC ductwork cleaning.

**Int. 195, 196, 197 (37) – Amendments – Housing Projects and Programs**

*Q: On item 2012-293 – provide a listing of all properties identified or completed, and is there more space for people to apply? (Ortiz)*

A: Properties have not yet been identified; we expect the project to begin later this month.

*Q: What constitutes an eligible owner (Ord. 2012-293) and what is meant by bring properties into code compliance? (Warren)*

A: An eligible owner must own a 1-4 unit privately-held residential structure located in and around the El Camino and Holy Rosary project areas. Owners must

also be current with City property taxes. Code compliance means that, if property owners have existing property code violations (peeling paint, broken porch rails, faulty stairways, broken windows, etc.), grant funds will be used to correct these deficiencies.

*Q: For funding for Habitat for Humanity – did that go out to RFP? Where will those homes be located? (Warren)*

A: A RFP was not used. Habitat for Humanity had secured state funding to be used for housing rehabilitation in the JOSANA neighborhood. In support of this and the overall JOSANA neighborhood plan, the City agreed to provide matching funds to this organization.

*Q: What will the complete construction costs be at 197 Woodward? (Miller)*

A: The total development cost is \$178,719.

#### **Int. 208, 209, 210, 211 (24) – Consolidated Community Development 2013-14 Annual Action Plan**

*Q: This was held up for final HUD numbers; we still do not have them. Why can this not come in April like it used to? And the CIP should be coming in March like it used to, as well. This all being so close to the Budget does not allow for the proper due diligence. (Conklin)*

A: April is a better timeframe, but in recent years has proved impossible. We hoped to go in May this year, and will try to do so next year, or April if possible. HUD has increasingly delayed their awards announcement which makes planning for spending difficult. This year was particularly hard due to the federal sequester and budget issues. Estimates for our award ranged widely. In a year (the 4th of a 5 year plan) where the goal was to at least maintain our efforts and funding levels to various activities, having more clarity on the awards was important. As it turns out, the awards were announced last week and we will come back to Council in July to update the plan. We are also delaying the ESG awards until July due to the cut in that funding.

#### **Int. 215 (28) – 2013-14 Consolidated Community Development Plan – Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS**

*Q: Do you need to go out to RFP? And why not, and why isn't the form attached? (Conklin/ Warren)*

A: The programs are for continuing services under our 5-year Consolidated Plan. We are now entering year 4 of that plan. NBD plans on beginning the planning process for the next 5-year plan in FY13-14 and, in general, we anticipate conducting an RFP process for programs in anticipation of the implantation of the next plan. However, in this case, we may not need to go out to RFP because the two organizations are uniquely qualified to serve this special needs population. Both

organizations receive additional State and Federal HIV/AIDS-targeted funds, which provide for deeper case management, housing placement, and other critical services.

**Int. 216 (30) – 2013-14 – Consolidated Community Development Plan – Homebuyer Assistance Program**

*Q: Has there been any change on the median family income guidelines? Provide an update. (Conklin)*

A: HUD Median Family Income limits decreased in 2013. **ATTACHED** is a chart showing the current limits we use for income qualifying our buyers.

*Q: What organization does this get facilitated through? (Ortiz)*

A: Home Buyer Assistance closing cost grants are facilitated by City staff. Home Buyer Services in the Housing Division of NBD processes the applications and administers the grant funds.

**Int. 217 (31) – 2013-14 Consolidated Community Development Plan, Foreclosure Prevention**

*Q: How do clients get referred? (Haag)*

A: Clients are referred in a variety of ways including: self-referral, acquaintances, lenders, service agencies, attorneys, HUD, 211, and through participation in events. The program is marketed through various media, including: RTS bus ads, billboard placement (ex: State Street on western wall of underpass facing Inner Loop exit west.), *Minority Reporter*, *The Challenger*, and advertisements on Time Warner. Direct outreach is also provided by Housing Council to community organizations and to individual homeowners where a default is known.

**Int. 228 (32) – Amendatory Agreement – Hardy Properties, Inc., Hardy Park Apartments**

*Q: Council Staff will set up a meeting with Councilmembers Conklin, Miller and any others who have not been briefed that want to be.*

**Int. 230 (40) – Rescinding Ordinance 2013-123 and Amending Ordinance No. 2011-322, Emergency Assistance Repair Program**

*Q: The last paragraph says administered by the City – what does that mean, that we are going to administer the program or are we the pass-through again? (Conklin)*

A: This legislation is making a correction to the legislation previously authorized by City Council to complete a group of approved EARP projects prior to the cancelation of the program, and does nothing regarding the re-launch of the rehab programs. The City will administer the projects in-house and provide construction management services. A pass-through will not be used.

All previous agreements were canceled during the City review of the program. The funds were previously authorized by quadrant. Ordinance 2013-123 was improperly calculated to allow the City to administer several projects that were pending for emergency repair services for homeowners. This authorization will bring all of the previously authorized funds back into City control until a determination is made on future program guidelines.

*Q: Provide more detail on what will be done, what types of projects, and who is doing it. (Council)*

A: When the program was halted as part of the City review, 18 homeowners were already in the queue for emergency repairs. These funds will allow the City to administer the repair work directly to meet the expectations of these homeowners.

*Q: Does this bring all the money back in, and who are we authorizing the \$216K to – the City? The balance numbers are inaccurate; the \$240K should be \$294K? (Council)*

*Q: Is this all coming in-house? Does this rescind all agreements? (Spaul/ Warren)*

A: Yes, this brings all funds back to the City. Correct - It should be \$294,000; a corrected transmittal letter has been provided. The balance of funding will be authorized in the future upon the re-launch of a repair program.

All previous agreements were canceled as part of the City review. No new agreements will be in place without prior Council review and authorization.

*Q: Why did this come over, without the final briefings being done? (Warren)*

A: This allows the City to administer the emergency repairs for the homeowners with pending emergency repair work. The legislation does not establish new contracts or programs in response to the review. Additional briefings and discussions will occur prior to requesting Council authorization of the future program.



**2013**  
**Median Family Income (MFI) Income Limits**  
**Rochester, NY MSA**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 MFI \$66,600**

Family Size	30%	50%	HOME 60%	65%	80%	100%	115%	120%
1	\$ 14,000	\$ 23,350	\$28,860	\$ 30,300	\$ 37,350	\$ 46,600	\$ 53,600	\$ 55,950
2	16,000	26,650	33,000	\$ 34,650	42,650	\$ 53,300	\$ 61,250	\$ 63,950
3	18,000	30,000	37,140	\$ 38,950	48,000	\$ 59,950	\$ 68,950	\$ 71,950
4	20,000	33,300	41,220	\$ 43,300	53,300	\$ 66,600	\$ 76,600	\$ 79,900
5	21,600	36,000	44,520	\$ 46,750	57,600	\$ 71,950	\$ 82,700	\$ 86,300
6	23,200	38,650	47,820	\$ 50,200	61,850	\$ 77,250	\$ 88,850	\$ 92,700
7	24,800	41,300	51,120	\$ 53,700	66,100	\$ 82,600	\$ 94,950	\$ 99,100
8	26,400	44,000	54,420	\$ 57,150	70,400	\$ 87,900	\$ 101,100	\$ 105,500

For each person in excess of eight, the four-person income limit should be multiplied by an additional eight percent (.08).

Sources: 1. <http://www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/il/il13/index.html> for 30%, 50%, and 80% MFI  
 2. City of Rochester for MFIs of 65%, 100%, 115% and 120% MFI  
 3. 60% guidelines for the HOME Program revised by HUD on 2/9/12 and are available at following website:  
<http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/affordablehousing/programs/home/limits/index.cfm>

Effective Dates: February 9, 2012 for 60% HOME Program Income Limits  
 December 11, 2012 for all income limits except 60% MFI

(Note: the revised 60% limits were not provided by HUD on 12/11/12 - only the 30%, 50%, and 80% were provided by HUD on 12/11/12)

G:\Bus&HousingDev\HOUSING\NEWINCOM guidelines HUD\FY 2013\2013 Income Guidelines - Final - 1-3-13.xls

## JOBS, PARKS & PUBLIC WORKS

### Int. 199 (13) – Inter-Municipal Agreement – U.S. Marshals Service, Fueling and Vehicle Maintenance

*Q: Why do we charge \$0.15 if RGRTA is charging us \$0.195 – is that the going rate? (Conklin)*

A: We charge \$0.15 per gallon as a surcharge because that amount reflects our actual cost to administer the fuel agreement (including billing and reconciliation activities). The agreement was intended as an emergency backup plan between agencies, with the charged rate for fuel representing our actual market cost and the administrative markup calculated at our cost. RGRTA's administrative markup rate reflects their cost calculations